

down the harsher features of Mr. Phillips's speech. Indeed, I take the fact that they have omitted to

publish certain words of his, delivered on that occasion, as a confession of their utter unworthiness. *He [Douglass] is the last man I expected to meet here.* *He [Douglass] ought not to be here occupying a front seat, after what he has said.* This, and more of the same sort, would not look well on paper, and perhaps would not have been said in the same opinion. He sounded like some of the million of slaves, who, on the pro-slavery papers, that Phillips ought to leave this country, because he thinks badly of the Constitution. But here is the matter as reported for the *Liberator*:

‘In conclusion, Mr. Phillips said, that while he was just, and meant to be, to the great majority on this side of the water or the other, and to any great name that stood high in the world’s esteem, he wished to make an appeal to the sympathy of the friends of the oppressed, who were going to assist their friend, FRANKER DOUGLASS, to explain the doubt he had cast, in the columns of his paper, upon the integrity of the American Anti-Slavery Society. And he would say, that when he had an explanation to ask of any professed friend, he always asked it the first day of his arrival in the city. He said that he had lately been the disposition of their friend DOUGLASS to represent, in his paper, the American Anti-Slavery Society as seeking to prevent the attendance of HENRY C. WRIGHT, PARKER PILLSBURY, and STEPHEN S. FOSTER, at their Anniversary in New York City, on account of the alleged illiberality of the American Anti-Slavery Society in its public estimation, with respect to their religious views. He had never known the hour when he had been anything else but proud to be the fellow-laborer of these devoted friends of the slave; and when he should be of such service to the slave’s cause as either of them, he would be as worthy of the confidence of the great Anti-Slavery public as their lives had proved them to be, he should feel himself in his proper sphere as a laborer in the Anti-Slavery field. As a member of the Board of Managers of the American Society, he felt this charge

DOUGLASS what reason he had even to insinuate that the absence of those gentlemen was designed—a was a propitiation to a New York mob—a was a propitiation to the pro-slavery religion of the country? They ought not to be taken to task for not appearing, and he would not be worthy of that paragraph. He asked the question there, because he should be ashamed to go out to an Anti-Slavery gathering elsewhere, and have it said that he had not been there. He would not be ashamed to tell him what ground he had to make against them so serious, so fatal a charge.

Mr. DOUGLASS, in reply, said that he should have been better pleased with the question of his friend Phillips, and far more ready to answer it, if he had stated the precise language, or anything near the language, he used. (Mr. M. said that he had not been present.) He was really in respect to that matter had no personal reference to any individual connected with the American Anti-Slavery Society; nor was the conjecture based upon the usual grounds of conjecture. He was anxious to prevent the appearance of those gentlemen at that meeting. As he now remembered the substance of the remarks alluded to, it was simply a conjecture that those gentlemen had possibly remained away from the Annual Meeting, because they were free to any one who should think the ground of infidelity. He did not admit the right of any individual to summon him on that platform to answer questions thus categorically put. He did not come there to answer questions, but to deliver a lecture on the American or the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society. In his paper, like Mr. Phillips on that platform, he felt at liberty to criticise the character of any Anti-Slavery effort or any Anti-Slavery Society in existence; and he felt at liberty to summon free to any one who should think justice had been done to any party. He dissented entirely from Mr. Phillips's position, that he might not entertain an opinion of the shortcomings and mistakes of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and yet sit under his hands and receive instructions from him. He said he felt that they were there for another purpose than to discuss the relation which he held to the American or the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, and he would not be bound to answer questions on that point of discussion. If, at another time, he should be called upon to show wherein he did not agree with his friends about

him, why he had felt some estrangement from them, he could do so, and with none of the malice, none of the bitterness which he had been unjustly—*very unjustly*—ascribed to him.’

Having no desire for controversy with any friend of the slave, and being anxious that all my strength shall be thrown against the enemies of liberty, and the oppressed people, I promise my reply, only that I mean this to be my last article on this subject. The pressure from without is powerful enough, and hard enough to withstand, without provoking internal feuds. But now that the matter is up, I will make clean work of it.

The paragraph upon which Mr. Phillips based his remarks at Framingham appeared in my paper

Three months ago. Here it is:

There was another feature of the meeting, which could not fail to be noticed by those accustomed to attend on such occasions, namely, the absence of Stephen S. Foster, Parker Pillsbury and Henry C. Wright; neither of these champions of freedom—men who have stamped their names on the pages of our country's recent annals, and who run as men read—were there. One of the first of them should have been on hand. Their absence cannot but excite remark. They are the spice of such occasions. Indignities, to be sure, for they have the faculty of saying just what they think, without much regard to the feelings of those to whom they are addressed. The mark on his restoration to its place in New York.

'Now, we suspect that these gentlemen have been induced to absent themselves on this occasion because their presence might give new force to the charge of infidelity, which was brought against the American Society; and we charge the Society with being unfavorably to its prospects, especially in Scotland. If we are right in this conjecture, we are bound to commend their motive, while we must condemn the principle upon which they have acted, and the wisdom of their policy. The absence of these gentlemen will doubtless increase the cry of infidelity, though their presence might increase it. The fact that they stayed away, taken in connection with others, is not liable to be esteemed as a confession of past offences, and an acknowledgment of the justice of the censures pronounced upon them; so that both the principle and the fact are false and mistaken. We have a platform as broad as the truth, and as wide as the world to stand upon; and we have an interest in maintaining its breadth. There is a principle of vital importance to the slave and to every other victim of injustice involved in the matter. To make the platform narrow for such men as Wright, Foster, and Pillsbury, is not to be endured in silence. We don't say it has been done; but we do say that, considering the circumstances, there is reason for the conjecture.'

It will be seen that the foregoing makes no allusion to any action of Mr. Phillips in the matter. There is no imputation either upon any committee

of which he is a member. The simple purport of that paragraph is, that the persons named in it might have remained away from the late anniversary of the American Anti-Slavery Society, because they were obnoxious on account of their religious opinions. That is all. It is not affirmed that they were kept away by any body, or that anybody wished to keep them away; but it is simply conjectured that they themselves had remained away for the reasons supposed. Now, that Mr Phillips should feel himself personally hit by that paragraph is a thing not worthy of notice. He was certainly not present in my mind when I wrote that paragraph; and why he should be so ready to defend



himself from imputations never cast upon him, is a thing, perhaps, that he can best explain.

But suppose the charge to have been preferred against him as a member of the 'Board' of the American Anti-Slavery Society, there was nothing in such a charge, I intend, at which Mr. Phillips could properly take so serious umbrage. Had the Committee even proceeded to select the most selected other speakers than Messrs. Pillsbury, Foster, and Wright, leaving them out altogether, and had they been charged with this omission, in plain terms, that charge would not have affected their integrity. Nothing is more common, in the action of the managers of Societies, than the exercise of such discrimination, in selecting speakers, on given occasions. It is a prerogative never disclaimed by any Society. One man is selected, and another is not selected; one, perhaps, because he is judicious and argumentative, is called upon to move this or that resolution; another, perhaps, for the opposite reason, is selected to do something else; and this is all quite defensible, for every Society has the right to put its best foot foremost. To do so, or to be charged with doing so, is no imputation upon its integrity. Such action would only be adapting proper means to legitimate ends—the practice of a wise discretion—to use the favorite maxim of Abigail Kelly Foster, it would be but giving 'the tools to them that can use them.' But I seem to be sheltering under this plea, since Mr. Phillips is determined to put the worst possible construction upon my words, and to bring from a meaning wholly foreign to their natural import. I will meet him upon his own ground, and reply not only to his written speech, but to his spoken speech.

One of the sins alleged against me at Framingham, and one deemed of special significance at the time, but which is, strangely enough, omitted in the *Liberator's* report, is this: He (Douglass) had been careful to make proclamation that H. C. Wright, Parker Pillsbury, Stephen S. Foster, are called infidels. To this I reply, I am not at all guilty of having called any of these gentlemen infidels. I mentioned the circumstance, to be sure, but in no unfriendly spirit. The thing required no care to proclaim it. From the importance attached by Mr. Phillips to this point, it would almost appear that I had dragged forth, and given notoriety to an obscure fact; and yet, the thing has been a thousand times proclaimed by the gentlemen themselves. Indeed, these gentlemen seldom make an Anti-Slavery speech, that they do not mention this charge as being made against them. No, Mr. Phillips, this 'proclamation' (a large word) was already made. I only made mention of it; and, probably, carried the information to a single person that did not know it before. Another fault, said to my account at Framingham is, (and no report is made of it,) that I neither affirmed nor denied the charge brought against these gentlemen. It was said, 'that the time was when I would have denied the charge of infidelity brought against them.' I admit that there was once such a time—a time when I would have denied it to all practical purposes, such a charge. That I did not do it now, is not owing to an unkind or to an unjust disposition towards either of the gentlemen named; but it is owing to an altered state of the case. These gentlemen have made progress, and do not stand where they once did. If the charge of infidelity, now brought against them, were the result of their faithfulness to the cause of the slave, it would be purely the invention of a pro-slavery church, and of a dumb-dog ministry, conceived and brought forth with the diabolical purpose of giving aid and comfort to the traffickers in human flesh, without any probable foundation, (as I once honestly supposed it to be.) I would denounce it now, as I did then, with the same vehemence. But I put it to Mr. Phillips with point-blank pungency, to say whether he believes this charge to have no other foundation than the malice of a pro-slavery church? He knows, and knows very well, that other than the malice of such a church has given currency to this charge. It is, therefore, asking a little too much of me, an Abolitionist, to deny the charge of infidelity, brought against me, from the charge of infidelity. These gentlemen do not themselves ask it. Messrs. Pillsbury and Wright would scorn to ask it. They not only are disbelievers in the Bible, and scout its inspiration, but, if there be any meaning in words, they glory in such disbelief, and laugh at the absurdity of recognising any book as divine authority. A pretty ridiculous thing, indeed, should I act, defending these gentlemen from the charge of infidelity!

I should have to invent a new dictionary, and change the meaning of words, to defend these gentlemen from the charge of being infidels. 'An infidel' (according to Webster) is one who disbelieves the inspiration of the Scriptures, and the divine origin of Christianity.

According to this definition, and to the plain use of words, these gentlemen are infidels; and it would have been either the utmost folly or the grossest dishonesty in me to have pursued the course commended by Mr. Phillips, and to have defended these gentlemen.

This, indeed, I could have done, and did do, denied the right of any man to make the individual opinions of these gentlemen a ground of separation from them in their efforts to give liberty to the enslaved people of this country, and (as I understand Mr. Wright and Mr. Pillsbury) this is all they ask. It is certainly all that they or their friends have any right to demand. We believe in him, no credit was given me by Mr. Phillips for doing this. It was not the good that I did, but the good that I omitted to do, which he remembered; and that omitted good was the non-denial of the infidelity of Messrs. Pillsbury and Wright.

But to the main question of Mr. Phillips, namely, what reason had I to disbelieve that the infidelity of Messrs. Pillsbury, Foster and Wright, was designed? I answer: First, Messrs. Pillsbury, Foster and Wright are probably the most unpopular members in 'the American Anti-Slavery Society.' Second, the American Anti-Slavery Society had, for two years, been wholly unable to obtain, in the city of New York, a hall in which to hold its annual meeting; that during these two years, it had an annual meeting in the cities of Syracuse and Rochester; and that at each of these meetings, the unpopular gentlemen spoken of were present, and took a conspicuous part, as, indeed, they have taken such part generally, in the meetings of the Society. The fact that these three persons, so nearly allied in opinion and position, should be absent from the late annual meeting, is, to say the least, a striking coincidence, and might well provoke a remark. But there is another reason, taken in connection with this, which makes the coincidence still more remarkable. Perhaps there never was, certainly not since the separation in 1840, such an effort made by the Executive Committee of the present American Anti-Slavery Society, as at this anniversary. Circulars were not only sent to a few individuals who were invited to speak on the occasion, but many were sent out to private individuals, urging their special attendance on the occasion. It is true, I got no special circular (and perhaps this helped along the attack), but my neighbors did. Now, it did seem, when the rank and file were so bountifully supplied with special invitations, all the more singular that three such champions (and they so much alike) should have been elsewhere than on the spot, on an occasion where such special pains had been taken to produce every 'shabaz' in the locality. But, in addition to this, a 'shabaz' of course was pursued to obtain the presence of distinguished persons on that occasion. Had any one told me, before that meeting, that any temptation would ever induce 'the American Anti-Slavery Society' to issue special letters, inviting New Organizationists to attend their annual meeting, I should have met it with a prompt denial. But the fact cannot be denied, that at that meeting, that sundry gentlemen, not in sympathy with the distinctive peculiarities of the Society, and who have not acted with it for the last dozen years, were especially invited to be present, and to take part in its deliberations. Distinguished members of what are termed the pro-slavery church were especially invited to attend. Even a member of the Executive Committee of that most bitterly hated of all Societies, the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, (a Society for attending whose anniversary, I received a polite rebuke from the very gentleman to whom I am now replying,) was especially addressed, and invited to be present.

Now, I confess that all this looks very much like an attempt to put the best foot foremost, as I have elsewhere said. Let it not be supposed, however, that I disapprove of this unusual catholity; I only wish it were a little more usual.

Well, taking these things together, with what came out at the same meeting, about the probability of aid from England and Scotland, growing out of the charge of infidelity against the

Society, the thought did arise (and I contend very naturally) that Messrs. Foster, Pillsbury and Wright might have been induced to remain away, to screen the Society from the odium of their infidel opinions. Here I drop the subject; and while I have no desire ever to recur to it, I wish still to have it distinctly understood, not less by my kind friends than by my bitterest enemies (for I have both), that they need never to expect me to shrink from any legitimate controversy (personal or otherwise) growing out of my relations to the cause of the oppressed and enslaved people of the United States. Yet I appreciate the wisdom of the Apostolic injunction, 'If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men.'

From the National Anti-Slavery Standard.  
FREDERICK DOUGLASS.

Were we the 'vigilant enemies' of Frederick Douglass—were we feeling toward him those of 'unconquerable hate'—were we on purpose to 'extort the energies and expend the funds' of the Association we represent, to fling at his head 'the head of an appointed victim,' the 'hatchet of fratricidal war'—did we mean to 'pursue, misrepresent, traduce and vilify him, with a bitterness ever increasing, and a steadiness and violence only characteristic of malice, deep, brooding, and unrelenting'—in short, not to put altogether too agonizing and fine a point upon it, were we, in common with all the rest of the American Anti-Slavery Society, its President and Vice-Presidents, its Secretaries and its Treasurers, its Board of Managers, its Executive Committee, and its lay members, both male and female, the wicked, malicious, unscrupulous, arrogant, exterminating, negro-hating, and hypocritical conspirators which Mr. Douglass represents us to be, we should rejoice at the article from his paper to which we give so large a space in the present number of our own. In one sense, indeed, we are gratified that thereby comes an end, we hope, to all further efforts of having exercised, in the matter, I mentioned the circumstance, to be sure, but in no unfriendly spirit. The thing required no care to proclaim it. From the importance attached by Mr. Phillips to this point, it would almost appear that I had dragged forth, and given notoriety to an obscure fact; and yet, the thing has been a thousand times proclaimed by the gentlemen themselves. Indeed, these gentlemen seldom make an Anti-Slavery speech, that they do not mention this charge as being made against them. No, Mr. Phillips, this 'proclamation' (a large word) was already made. I only made mention of it; and, probably, carried the information to a single person that did not know it before. Another fault, said to my account at Framingham is, (and no report is made of it,) that I neither affirmed nor denied the charge brought against these gentlemen. It was said, 'that the time was when I would have denied the charge of infidelity brought against them.' I admit that there was once such a time—a time when I would have denied it to all practical purposes, such a charge. That I did not do it now, is not owing to an unkind or to an unjust disposition towards either of the gentlemen named; but it is owing to an altered state of the case. These gentlemen have made progress, and do not stand where they once did. If the charge of infidelity, now brought against them, were the result of their faithfulness to the cause of the slave, it would be purely the invention of a pro-slavery church, and of a dumb-dog ministry, conceived and brought forth with the diabolical purpose of giving aid and comfort to the traffickers in human flesh, without any probable foundation, (as I once honestly supposed it to be.) I would denounce it now, as I did then, with the same vehemence. But I put it to Mr. Phillips with point-blank pungency, to say whether he believes this charge to have no other foundation than the malice of a pro-slavery church? He knows, and knows very well, that other than the malice of such a church has given currency to this charge. It is, therefore, asking a little too much of me, an Abolitionist, to deny the charge of infidelity, brought against me, from the charge of infidelity. These gentlemen do not themselves ask it. Messrs. Pillsbury and Wright would scorn to ask it. They not only are disbelievers in the Bible, and scout its inspiration, but, if there be any meaning in words, they glory in such disbelief, and laugh at the absurdity of recognising any book as divine authority. A pretty ridiculous thing, indeed, should I act, defending these gentlemen from the charge of infidelity!

I should have to invent a new dictionary, and change the meaning of words, to defend these gentlemen from the charge of being infidels. 'An infidel' (according to Webster) is one who disbelieves the inspiration of the Scriptures, and the divine origin of Christianity.

According to this definition, and to the plain use of words, these gentlemen are infidels; and it would have been either the utmost folly or the grossest dishonesty in me to have pursued the course commended by Mr. Phillips, and to have defended these gentlemen.

This, indeed, I could have done, and did do, denied the right of any man to make the individual opinions of these gentlemen a ground of separation from them in their efforts to give liberty to the enslaved people of this country, and (as I understand Mr. Wright and Mr. Pillsbury) this is all they ask. It is certainly all that they or their friends have any right to demand. We believe in him, no credit was given me by Mr. Phillips for doing this. It was not the good that I did, but the good that I omitted to do, which he remembered; and that omitted good was the non-denial of the infidelity of Messrs. Pillsbury and Wright.

But to the main question of Mr. Phillips, namely, what reason had I to disbelieve that the infidelity of Messrs. Pillsbury, Foster and Wright, was designed? I answer: First, Messrs. Pillsbury, Foster and Wright are probably the most unpopular members in 'the American Anti-Slavery Society.' Second, the American Anti-Slavery Society had, for two years, been wholly unable to obtain, in the city of New York, a hall in which to hold its annual meeting; that during these two years, it had an annual meeting in the cities of Syracuse and Rochester; and that at each of these meetings, the unpopular gentlemen spoken of were present, and took a conspicuous part, as, indeed, they have taken such part generally, in the meetings of the Society. The fact that these three persons, so nearly allied in opinion and position, should be absent from the late annual meeting, is, to say the least, a striking coincidence, and might well provoke a remark. But there is another reason, taken in connection with this, which makes the coincidence still more remarkable. Perhaps there never was, certainly not since the separation in 1840, such an effort made by the Executive Committee of the present American Anti-Slavery Society, as at this anniversary. Circulars were not only sent to a few individuals who were invited to speak on the occasion, but many were sent out to private individuals, urging their special attendance on the occasion. It is true, I got no special circular (and perhaps this helped along the attack), but my neighbors did. Now, it did seem, when the rank and file were so bountifully supplied with special invitations, all the more singular that three such champions (and they so much alike) should have been elsewhere than on the spot, on an occasion where such special pains had been taken to produce every 'shabaz' in the locality. But, in addition to this, a 'shabaz' of course was pursued to obtain the presence of distinguished persons on that occasion. Had any one told me, before that meeting, that any temptation would ever induce 'the American Anti-Slavery Society' to issue special letters, inviting New Organizationists to attend their annual meeting, I should have met it with a prompt denial. But the fact cannot be denied, that at that meeting, that sundry gentlemen, not in sympathy with the distinctive peculiarities of the Society, and who have not acted with it for the last dozen years, were especially invited to be present, and to take part in its deliberations. Distinguished members of what are termed the pro-slavery church were especially invited to attend. Even a member of the Executive Committee of that most bitterly hated of all Societies, the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, (a Society for attending whose anniversary, I received a polite rebuke from the very gentleman to whom I am now replying,) was especially addressed, and invited to be present.

Now, I confess that all this looks very much like an attempt to put the best foot foremost, as I have elsewhere said. Let it not be supposed, however, that I disapprove of this unusual catholity; I only wish it were a little more usual.

Well, taking these things together, with what came out at the same meeting, about the probability of aid from England and Scotland, growing out of the charge of infidelity against the

## THE LIBERATOR.

BOSTON, DECEMBER 30, 1853.

### FOREFATHERS' DAY.

The Landing of the Pilgrim Fathers was celebrated by the friends of Liberty and Progress, in connection with the Plymouth County Anti-Slavery Society, on Saturday and Sunday last, in Leyden Hall, at Plymouth. The meeting was addressed by Edmund Quincy, Nathaniel H. Whiting, Parker Pillsbury, Lewis Ford, and Wm. Lloyd Garrison. Much ground—pertaining to the past, the present, and the future—was covered by the speakers, and the vital relation of the Anti-Slavery Movement to the cause of liberty throughout the world, as well as to the safety and permanence of this republic, clearly and strongly portrayed. No more fitting tribute could have been paid to the memories of those who came over in the Mayflower in 1620. The following resolutions were presented by Mr. Garrison, comprehending all that was necessary to be affirmed on that occasion:—

Resolved, That we commemorate the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers in no ostentatious manner, by the performance of no hollow rites, with no parade of affected veneration for their character and deeds,—but by resolutely grappling with the overshadowing and demoralizing Slave Power of the land; by repudiating a Government which is pledged to the support of man-stealing, and a Church which is dripping with blood, and thoroughly polluted; by acknowledging our allegiance to the higher law of God, as against the lower law of Congressional demagogues and judicial parasites; by remembering those in bonds as bound with them; by seeking to break their fetters by the omnipotence of truth; by a steadfast persistency in the right, a stiff conformity to popular wrong, and uncompromising adherence to principle,—regardless of established customs and institutions, prevailing opinions and ideas, legislative enactments and legal precedents, religious edicts and priestly interpretations, and whatever else interposes to hinder individual liberty and universal emancipation.

Resolved, That while a fragment of Plymouth Rock remains, it will rebuke the pharisaical devotee, the trimming demagogue, the facile conformist, the cowardly persecutor, the effeminate self-seeker, and justify unlimited contumacy, agitation, division, strife, and secession, for righteousness' sake.

Resolved, That though it is true that 'the Pilgrim spirit has not died,' it is equally true that, throughout this nation, its living presence is regarded as disorganizing, schismatical, revolutionary and infidel, as it was at the time of the embarkation of the Pilgrim Fathers at Delft Haven, and treated accordingly.

The friends of the cause from abroad were greatly indebted, as usual, to the friends in Plymouth for a most hospitable entertainment.

### CAPTAIN DRAYTON.

This noble man and generous hero, says the *Commonwealth*, left us on Monday, doubtless never to visit us again. His constitution was wholly broken down by his imprisonment, and since his liberation, his little remaining health and strength have been continually wasting. He came on here a few weeks since, hoping to spend some time in Massachusetts, in travelling, and selling his narrative, (which has just been published), and thus do something for his own support. But, from the severity of the weather, or other causes, his health declined, and he became so feeble as seldom to leave the house, and finally to lose all hope of ever being essentially better, though from the nature of his disease, he may perhaps live a year or two. He is entirely destitute, and his friends here, solicitors that he shall have every comfort, so long as he may need it, have proposed to raise five hundred dollars for his benefit. As this will probably be the last opportunity that will ever be afforded us of administering to his wants, we hope that our readers will feel it an imperative, as well as grateful duty, to do something for one so deserving of their admiration and sympathy. Contributions may be sent to Mr. FRANCIS JACKSON, of Boston.

### TWO REMARKABLE SERMONS.

Sometimes the Pulpit is 'faithful to its high trust'—and whenever any such phenomenon is witnessed, it excites almost as much surprise and interest, generally, as the appearance of a comet. This week, we have the pleasure to lay before our readers two remarkable Sermons, recently delivered by two courageous preachers of the same denominational faith—the one by CHARLES E. HODGES, of Barre, in this State, which exhibits all the nerve and earnestness of the testimonies of the ancient prophets, and rebukes the hypocrisy of the Church and State in the plainest manner. It justly criticises some things contained in the late Proclamation of the Governor for a day of Thanksgiving, and exposes the hollowness of the popular forms of religious worship, with absolute fidelity. We are not surprised to learn that it created considerable excitement in the town; for so it has been in other days, when popular iniquity was openly rebuked.

The other Sermon is by WILLIAM H. FURNESS, of Philadelphia, which was preached with special reference to the Second Decade Meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society, recently held in that city. It is a generous tribute to the earnest philanthropy and efficient action of that Society, and a most fitting vindication of its leading advocates from the malicious imputations so commonly brought against them. Mr. FURNESS is largely imbued with the spirit of a divine benevolence, and never fails to improve an opportunity to bear his testimony against popular wrong.

### A SLAVEHOLDER'S IDEA OF JUSTICE.

With what cool barbarity the southern slaveholder can appropriate the wife and children of another as his *bona fide* property, may be seen by the following letter, written in reply to one sent by an anti-slavery friend in behalf of a poor man who is trying to ransom his wife and children. We print it verbatim.

'The amount I agreed to take of him was considerably less than I would take of any person also; the fact is which—well knows, they could not be bought with money, under any other circumstances; as he suits me, and being raised together there is considerable attachment on both sides. \* \* \* Now they are not such poor people as you seem to think; they have a good home and are as well provided for as most of you in the North, and much better than your poor white Laborers, and free negroes; I have been among you and know something of your pretended humanity; I do not think I need go to you or any of your Abolition Brethren; to learn my Christian duty, I do not strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel, as some of you do; I have not conscientious scruples about my property; which is secured to me by the Constitution of the U. S. and sustained by the scripture of divine truth; therefore it would not be the satisfaction you seem to imagine, to give my property away; when that property would be seriously injured by the gift; and no benefit could accrue to the woman and children, for instance suppose they were in a free state with—, and he should become afflicted or die—what would they do then; thrown upon the cold charity of you close fisted gentry; I have laboured hard myself and by the blessing of God raised a large family of white and Black and now when they are getting old enough to render service; and pay for raising; I must give them away; for the sum you ask me to take; is not more than half their worth—I have a plenty to live on and feed and clothe them well; they eat such as I eat, and I am bound to support and take care of them in old age.'

'Look around you, and you can find objects of charity all around you; ready to receive all the sympathy that you are willing to bestow; I hope you will carry out your instructions to me and do as you would wish to be done by in similar situations.'

### NEW PUBLICATIONS.

**SPIRIT INTERCOURSE:** containing Incidents of Personal Experience while investigating the New Phenomena of Spirit Thought and Action; with various Spirit Communications through Himself as Medium. By HERMAN SHOW, late Unitarian Minister at Montague, Mass. Boston: Crosby, Nichols & Co. New York: C. S. Francis & Co. 1853. pp. 184.

This is one of the most interesting works that have yet appeared in relation to Spiritual Manifestations, and we commend the perusal of it to all candid inquirers on the subject. Mr. Show evinces commendable caution and good sense in his presentation of the question. He is not impulsive, nor given to blind credulity, but strongly inclined in the opposite direction—'so much so,' he says, 'that, in early life, I was for a long time a decided skeptic in regard to the generally received faith of the Christian world.' Hence, he was at first strongly impelled from having anything to do with these 'Manifestations'; and, afterward, he says he was 'excessively critical and captious' in his attempts to expose the matter; for he had no thoughts of becoming a believer. His first experiments were quite unsatisfactory, and tended to confirm his skepticism, so that he could, 'with a fair conscience, speak of the whole matter as either an undoubted delusion or a gross imposition; but subsequent investigations compelled him to substitute faith for unbelief; and the result is, he says, 'that I now find myself a firm believer in the reality of this new mode of spirit intercourse,' though not in all the claims that have been advanced, of this character. The 'spirit sermons,' in this volume, in respect to religious feeling and expression, are as recent and devout as any preached by the Rev. W. H. Corning; while the phenomena related, as witnessed by Mr. Show, are curious, surprising, and inexplicable, we think, on any other theory than that of independent spiritual agency.

**GOD WITH MEN:** or, Footsteps of Providential Leaders. By SAMUEL OSGOOD, Author of 'Studies in Christian Biography,' &c. Boston: Crosby, Nichols & Co. New York: Charles S. Francis & Co. 1853. pp. 269.

The author of this volume says that the papers which compose it 'were written in order to give the young people of his parish some idea of the course of Divine Revelation, through the representative characters of both dispensations.' They are as follows:—I. Abraham and the Empire of Faith. II. Moses and the Law. III. Aaron and the Priesthood. IV. Saul and the Throne. V. David and the Psalms. VI. Solomon and the Hebrew Wisdom. VII. Isaiah and the Prophets. VIII. John the Baptist and the Precursors of the Messiah. IX. The Messiah and his Preparation and Plan. X. The Messiah and his Ministry. XI. Peter and the Keys. XII. Paul and Gospel Liberty. XIII. John and the Word. XIV. The Disciples and the Unseen Witness. XV. The Theologians and the World to Come.

**THE PEOPLE'S JOURNAL.** New York: Alfred E. Beach, 86 Nassau Street.

This is an illustrated Record of Agriculture, Mechanics, Science, and Useful Knowledge, published monthly, each number containing 32 large pages of letter-press, beautiful printed on fine paper, and profusely illustrated with engravings, finely executed; price only 50 cents a volume! Two volumes are published annually. The number for November contains 48 engravings, some of them very large; and for December contains no less than 72 engravings! This is rightly named 'THE PEOPLE'S JOURNAL,' and deserves to have a circulation by millions. Its influence upon the enterprise, invention and intelligence of the country cannot fail to be great and beneficial.

**NORTON'S LITERARY AND EDUCATIONAL REGISTER FOR 1854.** New York: Charles B. Norton, 71 Chambers Street.

This is an exceedingly valuable pamphlet, of two hundred pages, embodying a large amount of information in regard to Literature and Education, both at home and abroad. It contains a list of all the works that have been published in America and England, during the year 1853—sketches and statistics of the British Museum, Royal Library at Berlin and Munich, Library at St. Genevieve—of New York City, Philadelphia, Boston, Providence, Albany, and St. Louis. Also, Library Statistics of all the States in the Union; Educational Information respecting England, Ireland and Wales, and various European countries. Also, the Proceedings of the Librarians' Convention, held in the city of New York, in September last—&c., &c.

**THE SCHOOL FELLOW—A Magazine for Boys and Girls.** Boston: Frederick Parker, 35 Washington Street—Evans & Britton, 607 Broadway, New York.

This claims to be 'the best and cheapest Juvenile Magazine in the United States' and having obtained a high degree of popularity, commences its sixth volume with the New Year, enlarged and improved. Among its contributors are Mrs. Gilman, Caroline Howard, Miss Bates, Miss Tutill, Miss Chesbro—&c. It abounds with pictorial illustrations, is prettily executed, and afforded at only one dollar a year, in advance. Each number contains 36 pages, and is issued punctually on the first of every month.

**THE BOSTON ALMANAC, for the year 1854.** Published by John P. Jewett & Co. 17 and 19 Cornhill.

This Almanac is so well known as to need no commendation. As usual, its table of contents is crowded with all sorts of useful information. Though it bears a local title, it has a value and an interest as wide as New England. The Boston Almanac for 1848 contained views of the Churches then existing in the city. The present one gives views of twenty-four Churches since constructed.

**DOVECOTE:** or, the Heart of the Homestead. By the Author of the 'Cap Sheet.' Boston: John P. Jewett & Co. 1854. pp. 361.

This is another of the many neat, instructive and entertaining volumes published by Mr. Jewett, whose enterprise is eminently deserving of the most brilliant success. The work is divided into fifty-one chapters, and is written in a sprightly and enthusiastic manner. 'I have been building here,' says the author, 'only a nest of memories. It is a home nest—into which any one may look from out his chamber window. If it is large enough for but a single world-weary heart to brood in, it will not have been built in vain.'

**THE IRON RULE;** or, Tyranny in the Household. By T. S. Arthur.

**THE LADY AT HOME;** or, Happiness in the Household. By T. S. Arthur.

These tales are designed as companions, and may be profitably read in every family. Mr. Arthur is one of the best writers of stories in the land, and has secured multitudes of readers and a large share of popular commendation.

Published by T. B. Peterson, 102 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia. Price 25 cents.

### THE ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR.

On account of the fresh arrival of four new cases of goods, by the steamships America and Asia, it has been decided to keep the Fair open until SATURDAY EVENING, Dec. 31st. We hope that, on the closing days and evenings, the Bazaar may be thronged with purchasers from country and from city, and that thus the women, at home and abroad, who have labored so abundantly for the anti-slavery cause, may be abundantly compensated for their labors of love. Surely, it is not asking any great sacrifice, to solicit the professed friends of the slave to purchase useful and beautiful articles, at a reasonable price, and thus to gratify their taste and their wants while aiding to break his fetters, and redeem our national character from infamy. Fail not to improve the time and opportunity.

### THE MARTYR KAUFFMAN.

SALEM, (Col. Co.) Ohio, Dec. 15, 1853.  
MY DEAR FRIEND—I have been thinking a great deal of the case of DANIEL KAUFFMAN. I cannot get it out of my mind. It seems to me that something should be done to save him from being reduced to want. I was not present when the subject was named in the meeting, or I should have proposed a subscription on the spot. Will you please put down my name for ten dollars? If a hundred people will subscribe ten dollars each, I will subscribe a second ten dollars. I know that many of the Anti-Slavery friends are poor, and I also know that many calls are made on them; still, we can meet the case before us, and I hope we shall do so. I would not let the pro-slavery monsters have the pleasure of thinking that they have either ruined a man for harboring a fugitive, or frightened others from imitating his example. If I were rich, I feel as if it would be a pleasure to bear the whole expense entailed on friend KAUFFMAN and his associates; but I am not. Besides, I want to give as much help to the cause of freedom here in the West as I can. I hope, therefore, the friends of freedom and righteousness will help friend KAUFFMAN over his difficulties, and let the persecutors of the good and noble see that their power to crush and kill is not so great as they are prone to think it.

My love to all the friends of freedom. I think of our Philadelphia meetings with great delight. The cause of truth and freedom is advancing, and if we Abolitionists are wise enough to respect the claims of truth and freedom in each other, it will continue to advance. But we must have no gagging. We must tolerate no attempt to stifle the godlike spirit in any one. The fears lest freedom of utterance in any meetings should injure the cause, are groundless. The danger is more on the other side. True policy, as well as fervent charity, will be nobly daring. It is badly policy, as well as selfishness, to move or stand still in dread of opponents or temporizers.

But let me not provoke a controversy. It is friend KAUFFMAN that I want helped. Raise him one or two thousand pounds, and I can be comfortable. Yours, affectionately, JOSEPH BARKER.

Will the Pennsylvania Freeman and other Anti-Slavery papers please copy?

### WORCESTER COUNTY A. S. SOCIETY.

WORCESTER, Dec. 19th, 1853.  
The annual meeting of the Worcester County (South) Anti-Slavery Society was held in Worcester, Horticultural Hall, Sunday, day and evening, Dec. 18th, 1853.

Chair taken by the President, and full and free discussion followed to all.

Rev. S. May, Jr., opened the meeting with a few introductory remarks, and was followed by a hymn from the Choir and congregation.

Mr. May then offered prayer, and read passages from Scripture.

Rev. A. T. Foss addressed the meeting on 'Christianity as the power of God, designed and given to overthrow all the works of the devil, with a special allusion to the law of Slavery'—illustrating his position by many historical illustrations from the day of Christ, down to the present time.

Adjourned to meet at half past 1 o'clock.

**ADDRESS.**—Remarks were made by Daniel S. Whitney. A discourse was then delivered by Parker Pillsbury, of great force and interest, from the text—'I came not to bring peace, but a sword.' A very large audience listened to this eloquent discourse—many standing throughout the whole.

The Committee on Nominations reported the following persons for officers for the ensuing year:

President—Ephraim L. Capron.

Vice Presidents—Josiah Henshaw, West Brookfield; Abijah Allen, Millbury; Moses Sawin, Daniel S. Whitney, Southboro'; Adin Ballou, Milford; Clark Aldrich, Westboro'.

Treasurer—John M. Fish of West Brookfield.

Corresponding and Recording Secretary—John H. Crane of Worcester.

Executive Committee—Samuel May, Jr., Leicester; Abby K. Foster, Sarah H. Earle, Eliza A. Stowell, Olive Loveland, Worcester; E. D. Draper, Milford; Henry Carpenter, Upton; Joseph A. Howland, W. Brookfield.

The nominations were unanimously accepted, and the officers chosen.

**Finance Committee.**—D. M. Loveland, John H. Crane, Provan, and Alfred Wyman.

At the close of Mr. Pillsbury's eloquent sermon, Dr. Stearns, of Boston, came on to the platform. What purported to be the spirit of Daniel Webster commenced speaking to the Society, employing Dr. S. for his medium; but being somewhat lengthy in his introductory remarks, he was called to order by Mr. McComb, who objected to having the time of the meeting taken up in the discussion of the subject of Spiritualism. D. S. Whitney hoped the speaker would be allowed to go on, and to have time to set himself right before the audience. The gentleman—I, e. Webster?—then proceeded to discuss the subject of slavery, taking the ground that slavery, though a sin, was preferable to anarchy and confusion, and that we ought not to be in haste to get rid of it. [The remarks of the speaker, let him belong to what sphere he may, were superficial in thought, and obscure in language.] He was again called to order by Mr. McComb. A discussion here ensued on the right of the speaker to proceed, in which Dr. Martin, Mr. Fay, D. S. Whitney, Mr. May, Mr. Miller, and several others participated. The President insisted on preserving order, and upon justice being done to all. He was willing that spirits in the body, or from without, should have a fair hearing, and should insist upon their being heard, so long as they confined their remarks to the question before the meeting. The Society then adjourned to evening.

Met again at 6½ o'clock, with a full house. Mr. Loring Moody first addressed the meeting on the dangers of being a Christian. Rev. A. T. Foss was introduced again, and made a short speech, and was followed by Parker Pillsbury. He occupied the time until the close of the meeting. Adjourned at half past 9.

EFFINGHAM L. CAPRON, President.

EMILIE A. LOVELAND, Recording Secretary.

### ANTI-SLAVERY IN RUTLAND.

FRIEND GARRISON.—Yesterday was a good day for the Anti-Slavery cause in this town.

In the morning, our friend, Andrew T. Foss, spoke to a small but very attentive congregation of our people, in the Methodist church, to good effect.

During the intermission, a friend asked Mr. Davis (the Congregational minister) if he would give up his evening meeting, and unite with us in an Anti-Slavery meeting. Mr. Davis very kindly said he would be glad to have Mr. Foss speak to his people that afternoon.

The invitation was gratefully accepted, and the people at the Methodist church, who were assembling, were notified of the change. The Congregational house was, by the union of the two meetings, well filled.

Our friend Foss spoke for one hour, with great clearness and force, upon the vitality of the Anti-Slavery cause as a test of the character of individuals and organized bodies of men. He succeeded in securing the earnest attention of the large audience to the last word. His powerful appeal to the youth, I am sure, cannot be without good effect. Mr. Davis gave up his evening meeting



**MR. PILLSBURY IN NEWBURYPORT.**  
NEWBURYPORT, Dec. 7, 1853.  
FRIEND GARRISON: Our friend, PARKER PILLSBURY, preached at Market Hall, last Sunday afternoon, and lectured in the evening on Slavery. He had good audiences, and the truth spoken had a good effect. What a man he is! Never did language so sublime, so true, so like coils of fire, drop from mortal lips as came from him last Sunday. Would it not be well to publish his sermon?

The Mayor and Aldermen of our city, at a meeting this week, revised the jury list, and every abolitionist's name was rejected; not one is allowed to be in the jury box. This is the second time this has been done; and in answer to an inquiry made by an abolitionist to one of these despots, he replied, we will not have them in the jury box, for they are opposed to the laws of our country; at the same time, the Mayor, Henry Johnson, Esq., is opposed to the Maine Law, and his influence has been with the rummies and rumblers. Ram Drinkers and some males who are almost idiots were put into the jury box.

Yours in haste, P.  
From the Newburyport Evening Union.

A new step in reform has been taken by Parker Pillsbury, the well-known anti-slavery lecturer, in turning preacher. Yesterday afternoon he had services at the Market Hall, as they are had in the churches, with the exception of singing. The Scriptures were read, the Lord's prayer included, and a sermon preached. Without reference to the doctrines, we may say that the sermon was well written, eloquent and stirring, pretty much as we might suppose that Luther preached in his time. How queer it will seem to see them form a church of their own, calling Garrison a Bishop. Pillsbury, Doctor of Divinity, and Foster, Professor of Theology!

Portrait of HENRY WARD BEECHER. If, as Byron says, it is the fate of famous men 'to get a wretched picture and worse bust,' Mr. Beecher is certainly in luck, and his multitudinous friends and admirers can congratulate him that his case is an exception to the general rule; for a most admirable and life-like three quarter length Portrait of this remarkable man has been very fully engraved by J. C. McFar, of New York, from the celebrated picture by Thomas Hicks. In size it is 17 1/2 by 13 1/2 inches. Price \$2. It is all that can be desired. It may be obtained of Mr. HENRY BOWEN, 86 Washington Street, Boston.

The proceedings of the Second Annual Meeting of the 'GARRISON ASSOCIATION,' held in the Belknap Street Church, will be published in our next number.

We are indebted to our friend, Mr. WILLIAM B. TOWNE, of Brookline, for the Index to the Volume of the Liberator for the present year.

THE NEW HYGIENIC COOK BOOK, with three hundred receipts for cooking on hygienic principles, containing also a Philosophical Exposition of the Relations of Food to Health; the Chemical Elements and Proximate Constitution of Alimentary Principles; the Nutritive Properties of all kinds of Aliments; the Relative Value of Vegetable and Animal Substances; and the Selection and Preservation of Dietetic Materials, &c., &c. By R. T. Trall, M. D. With one hundred illustrative engravings. 1 vol. 12mo. Price, delivered free, 87 cents. For sale by FOWLER & WELLS, New York, No. 131 Nassau street.

Boston, No. 142 Washington street.  
Philadelphia, No. 231 Arch street.  
Dec. 23. 4w

DIED—In Canadaigua, (N. Y.), Mr. WILLIAM K. FOSTER, aged 44, leaving a wife and five children to mourn their loss. He was a kind father, an affectionate husband, and a dutiful son. His parents have lost a faithful friend, and the prop of their old age. The poor, crushed and down-trodden slave has also lost in him a kind friend. Truly, he was a veteran in the cause of the colored race, although residing in the midst of a pro-slavery community. His end was peace. Although stigmatized in his life-time as an 'Infidel,' yet now he is no more, even his bitterest enemies are constrained to say he was a good man.—Com.

In Beverly, 17th Inst., Mrs. Rose, widow of the late Mr. Reuben Larcum, aged about 90. The deceased was one of the last of that race of familiar, kind and faithful colored servants, who got a generation or two ago. They were permanent and almost indispensable fixtures in all the families of 'property and standing' in the community. She was of the Lovett family, and her husband Reuben, to whom she was married in 1793, was of the Larcum family of servants.

Notices of Meetings, &c.

REV. A. T. POSS, an Agent of the MASS. A. S. Society, will lecture as follows:

New Bedford,.....	Sunday, day and eve'g., Jan. 1.	3.
Exeter, N. H.,.....	Tuesday eve'g., " " " " " " " " " " " "	3.
Newmarket, N. H.,.....	Wednesday " " " " " " " " " " " "	4.
Great Falls, " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " "	Thursday " " " " " " " " " " " "	5.
S. Eliott, Me.,.....	Friday " " " " " " " " " " " "	6.
Dover, N. H.,.....	Sunday, " " " " " " " " " " " "	8.
Rochester, N. H.,.....	Tuesday eve'g., " " " " " " " " " " " "	10.
Farmington Dock, N.H. Wednesday	" " " " " " " " " " " "	11.
Great Falls, " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " "	Thursday " " " " " " " " " " " "	12.
Salmon Falls,.....	Friday " " " " " " " " " " " "	13.
Portland, Me.,.....	Sunday " " " " " " " " " " " "	15.
Biddeford " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " "	Tuesday eve'g., " " " " " " " " " " " "	17.
Saco, " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " "	Wednesday " " " " " " " " " " " "	18.
Kennebunk, " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " "	Thursday " " " " " " " " " " " "	19.
Fortmouth " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " "	Sunday " " " " " " " " " " " "	22.

TREMONT TEMPLE will be open for public worship every Sunday morning and afternoon. Seats free.

MASSACHUSETTS STATE COUNCIL OF COLORED AMERICANS. The members elect of the State Council are hereby notified to meet in Boston, on Monday, Jan. 2, 1854. The hour and place of meeting will be duly announced.

WILLIAM C. NELL,  
JEREMIAH B. SANDERSON,  
National Members elect for Massachusetts.  
Boston, Dec. 20, 1853.

SITUATIONS WANTED.—Three active colored men, well acquainted with all kinds of porters or domestics. Apply to WILLIAM C. NELL, 21 Cornhill.

WANTED—A seamstress in a family. Apply to WILLIAM C. NELL, 21 Cornhill.

WANTS A SITUATION, in a private family—a young and active colored woman, who is competent to do all household work. Apply to R. F. WILGOTZ, 21 Cornhill.

WOMAN'S RIGHTS DOCUMENTS.

The undersigned wishes to collect some six or eight sets of documents thus published on this subject, to bind in as many volumes, and deposit in different public libraries. Any person, possessing spare copies of any of the Reports of Woman's Rights Conventions, will confer a favor by mailing them to the address below given—as some of these pamphlets are now difficult to obtain.

T. W. HIGGINSON,  
Worcester, Mass.  
Dec. 23.—3w

\$1000.

ON the receipt of \$1, (post paid,) I will send in strictest confidence, to any young man or woman, in honorable pursuit, in which any young man or woman can realize a profit of from \$3 to \$10 per day. This is no humbug. I have been engaged in the business for the two past years, and have realized a profit of \$15000 per year, and am still increasing it with increasing success. I have a number of young men travelling in various parts of the South and West, who are making a large salary for themselves, and a fair profit for me. To young men and others out of employment, I now offer facilities for money-making of an ordinary character. It is pleasant, honorable, and available at any time or position in life.

Address B. C. LAMBERT,  
Saratoga Springs, New York.  
Dec. 16. Iscott.



## POETRY.

## LONGING.

BY JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL.

Of all the myriad moods of mind  
That through the soul come thronging,  
Which one was ever so dear, so kind,  
So beautiful, as Longing?  
The thing we long for, that we are  
For one transcendent moment,  
Before the present, poor and bare,  
Can make its sneering comment.  
Still, through our paltry strife and strife,  
Glow down the wished ideal,  
And Longing moulds in clay what Life  
Carves in the marble Real;  
To let the new life in, we know,  
Desire must open the portal;  
Perhaps the Longing to be so  
Helps make the soul immortal.  
Longing is God's fresh heavenward will  
With our poor earthward striving;  
We quench it that we may be still  
Content with merely living;  
But would we learn that heart's full scope  
Which we are hourly wronging,  
Our lives must climb from hope to hope,  
And realize our Longing.

## WISHING.

BY JOHN G. SAXE.

Of all amusements for the mind,  
From logic down to fishing,  
There isn't one that you can find  
So very cheap as wishing!  
A very choice diversion, too,  
If we but rightly use it,  
And not, as we are apt to do,  
Pervert it and abuse it.  
I wish—a common wish, indeed—  
My purse was something fatter,  
That I might cheer the child of need,  
And not my pride to flatter;  
That I might make oppression reel,  
As only gold can make it,  
And break the tyrant's rod of steel,  
As only gold can break it!  
I wish—that sympathy and love,  
And every human passion  
That hath its origin above,  
Would come, and keep, in fashion;  
That scorn, and jealousy, and hate,  
And every base emotion,  
Were buried fifty fathoms deep  
Beneath the waves of ocean!  
I wish—that friends were always true,  
And motives always pure;  
I wish the good were not so few,  
I wish the bad were fewer;  
I wish that persons never forgot  
To heed their pious teaching;  
I wish that practising was not  
So different from preaching!  
I wish—that modest worth might be  
Appraised with truth and candor;  
I wish that innocence were free  
From treachery and slander;  
I wish that men their vows would mind;  
That women never were rovers;  
I wish that wives were always kind,  
And husbands always lovers!  
I wish—in fine—that joy and mirth,  
And every good ideal,  
May come, and flourish, throughout the earth,  
To be the glorious real;  
Till God shall every creature bless  
With his supremest blessing,  
And hope be lost in happiness,  
And wishing be possessing!

## KEEP UP A GOOD HEART.

Keep up a good heart! and look forth to the morrow;  
Don't turn to the past, it may serve to depress:  
The ill of to-day, for the future will borrow  
A summer of gladness to strengthen and bless.  
Be firm as the rock that in ocean is planted,  
Be brave as the tempest that faces the storm;  
Go forth with the step of the hero undaunted,  
Keep home for thy compass, and life beating warm.  
Keep up a good heart! it is useless repining;  
See glimpses of light on the track of life yet;  
Be hoping and striving, not always divining  
A pathway to sorrow, with thorns ill beset;  
'Tis better to watch for the rainbow than to rest—  
In beauty beyond, where the winds are at rest—  
'Each cloud hath a fragment of silver that gleams,  
To temper misfortune, and maketh us blest.  
Keep up a good heart! never sluggardly wasting  
The rich gems of thought and of feeling away;  
Go forward to duty, press on, and be tasting  
The produce of action: no longer delay.  
'Tis true, we must travel o'er many a mountain,  
And paint with the lifeblood of wearisome care;  
Yet deep in the valley there gushes a fountain,  
Its waters are living—be! never despair.  
Keep up a good heart! 'tis the best way to lighten  
The yoke of existence, whatever thy lot;  
Ere day-break 'tis darkest—the morning will brighten,  
Fear not, and for all there's a sunny spot.  
Hold fast the assurance, and firmly relying,  
Fear not, thou wilt reap the reward of the just;  
There's peace and there's pleasure—a comfort undying,  
Hue, true to their conscience, make heaven their trust.

## ST. STEPHEN.

With awful dread his murderers shook,  
As, radiant and serene,  
The lustre of his dying look  
Was like an angel seen,  
Or Moses' face of pale light,  
When down the Mount he trod,  
And glowing from the glorious sight  
And presence of his God.  
To us, with all his constancy,  
Be his rapt visions given,  
To look above by faith and see  
Revelations bright from heaven,  
And power to speak our triumphs out,  
As our last hour draws near,  
While neither clouds of fear nor doubt  
Before our view appear.

## SONNET.

As some tall column meets its overthrow,  
And, levelled in the dust, reclines, at length,  
In all its graceful symmetry of strength,  
So manhood, in his middle years, lies low,  
Sung by death from out the steepest,  
While yet he lifts his towering head elate,  
And feels the firmer for the very weight  
Of all that in dependence on him rest.  
Ah, why should we bewail his present fall,  
Though prostrate now, and basely undervalued,  
If at the Master-Builder's final call,  
He stand amid the upright as before,  
A pillar in the temple of his God,  
And from his happy station go no more?

## THE LIBERATOR.

## THE GOSPEL OF INFIDELITY.

Boston, Dec. 16, 1853.

To—  
You ask—'Why are you, &c., so sensitive to the word infidel?' 'If H. C. Wright is not an infidel, what is he?' I inquire honestly; for if any body had asked me if he was one, I should have answered, 'Yes, without a moment's hesitation.' You make these inquiries of Mr. Garrison, 'honestly.' I doubt not—and he very justly considers that I am the person to answer them, which I cheerfully do.

Whence the impression that I am 'sensitive to the use of the word infidel?' From any thing I have ever said or written? Certainly not; for it is long since all concern ceased in me about being so called. It has also long been settled as a matter of no importance 'to be judged of men' in this thing. A name is nothing; especially one which, like infidel, has so many meanings as there are tongues that speak it. How much of truth, justice, love of the spirit of Jesus is in my heart, my life must and will tell. Mine should be the endeavor, that my life shall be a true manifestation of the life of my God—so far as the human can interpret the divine life. I really feel no anxiety whatever, so far as I am concerned, as to what name men give to that life, provided I can but make the reality mine. Any name, however opprobrious for a time, and in the estimation of those who give it, may be made honorable and desirable. Witness the word *Christian*. What was it? What is it? An evil epithet, applied to one, conscious of pure motives, and earnest, self-forgetting desires, thoughts and deeds, for the relief of the suffering, and the elevation of the down-trodden and the debased, will assuredly, in time, come to stand for the character of the individual. So, when the term infidel has been applied to me, to bring reproach on principles or practices which I deem true, and deserving respect, I have ever felt too much self-respect to attempt a defence, except by my life; and when I have felt that the reproachful term was justly applied, I have thought I ought to be too just to feel injured, or to defend myself, except by a change of life. Thus I have ceased to feel any sensitiveness when infidel is applied to me.

Nor do I feel concerned lest Anti-Slavery, Non-Resistance, Total Abstinence, Woman's Rights, or any cause which I am led to espouse as righteous, can be injured by the word infidel being applied to me, or to any of its advocates. No principle, deed, or cause, intrinsically bad and harmful to human welfare, can be sanctified and sustained, permanently, by calling it Christian; none that is intrinsically good and beneficial, can be desecrated and defeated, or retarded, by calling it infidel. The first time I heard the name of WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, it was coupled with infidel, by way of reproach; and from that day to this, the church and clergy, generally, have sought to make them inseparable. Has this made the principles and measures he advocated powerless, or even retarded their progress? Did a similar term of reproach applied to Jesus, prove his doctrines to be untrue, his spirit bad, or his actions impious? Did it deform their beauty, or retard, at all, their spread? Infidel, as now used, is a term of reproach and condemnation; but, though the only argument used by the clergy and the church, to prove certain opinions to be erroneous, and prevent their spread, it proves nothing to be false, any more than *Christian* proves a doctrine to be true. Infidel no more determines a man's character for evil, than *Christian* does for good.

But you say—'If asked if H. C. Wright were an infidel, you should say yes.' You know the querist uses the word in a bad sense, to designate in me something reprehensible. What would you mean by infidel in such a positive answer to such a question, when you know your answer would give the impression that you intended to condemn me as unworthy of respect or confidence?

Would you mean by infidel that I was untrue to my own standard of right?—that I had no fidelity to my own acknowledged principles of justice and equity?—that I was faithless to my own convictions of God? No; this would not, I may venture to hope, be your meaning; for you would not give currency to such an accusation, against any one, unless you knew it to be true. I will think this of you, till I have cause to alter my mind.

Would you mean that I am opposed to the popular religion of the nation, and therefore to be condemned? This you could not mean, unless you are prepared to say it is wrong to be faithful and untrue to any popular idea which has been sanctioned and established by Church and State; and to take the Catholic ground that heresy is a crime, that heretics have no rights, and are justly punishable with death, or any penalty short of it. You would not thus reproach Jesus, the apostles, the martyrs, and all who have struggled for the true and the right against numbers and power. In 1836, and previously, total abstinence was denounced as infidelity. In 1834, and ever since, the doctrine that slavery is a sin, *per se*, was denounced as infidelity. The last work ever written by Moses Stuart, 'Conscience and the Constitution,' went to show that this doctrine is a libel on Christ and on God, and that all who asserted it were infidels. Non-Resistance, that forbids men to fight and kill one another, and inculcates love to enemies, forgiveness of injuries, good for evil, and the learning of war no more, is, at this hour, infidelity in this sense. The popular religion asserts that war and slavery may be right, and that God has the right to institute men to kill and enslave one another. In this sense, Wesley, Fox, Calvin and Luther were infidels.

Do you mean that I am an infidel because I differ from you, and am destitute of fidelity or reverence to what you cherish as sacred truth? No; this cannot be it; for then would you brand Jesus as the prince of infidels; for he differed from all the individuals about him in essentials. You would not accord to me the right of private judgment to decide for myself what is true and right, and then reproach me as unworthy of confidence, if I came to conclusions different from yours. This would be to make yourself an infallible standard, and condemn all as evil, who differed from you.

Do you mean by infidel that I reject the idea of immortality? Then am I conscious your answer is untrue, and there leave it. If you mean that I reject the doctrine of plenary inspiration—it is true. But do you say this is a reproach? Do you mean that it is wrong to reject a proposition, for whose truth you can see no proof? I cannot think you do. Why, then, call any man infidel, reproachfully, for doing that which you admit he must do, and has a right to do? For every man and woman must reject, and have a right to reject, that for whose truth they can see no proof. The argument, in my mind, is all against plenary inspiration; in yours, it may be all for it. Very well. My God calls on me to reject it, as yours does you to receive it. If faithful to your conviction, you deserve, and, so far as I am concerned, shall have, the meed of fidelity to yourself—the highest you can have. If I am equally true and honest to my conviction, will you award to me the same approval? We will you call me, reproachfully, infidel? Your heart will answer, No.

If by infidel you mean that I reject the Bible, I am not, I would deprive any mortal of it, high or low, bond or free—my conscience acquiesces in your accusation. I would take the Bible from none. I would destroy all that I conceive to be errors respecting it, and not them out of all minds. Truth, alone, will stand, Error must fall. If any views of the book be true, they will prevail; if yours, yours will prevail. Meantime, will you prove all things, and hold fast the good.

THE GOSPEL OF INFIDELITY? I am not ashamed of it, as the word infidel is used by slaveholders, war-making religionists; for it is the power of God unto salvation. The religion of this country—that is now called the gospel of Christ—comes with chains, fetters, whips, bloodhounds and rifles, to enslave and imbrute human beings; and the gospel of what the Church calls infidelity, comes to break every yoke, and let the oppressed go free. The gospel of Christ, as this nation receives it, comes to impose burdens, grievous to be borne; the gospel of what the clergy brand as infidelity says—'Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me, and find rest and peace.' The gospel of Christ, as construed by the American people and priesthood, is the death-knell of hope to millions of the imbruted and helpless. The gospel of infidelity brings glad tidings of peace and good will to all, even to the despised victims of American slavery. The gospel of what is called Christ passes by on the other side; the gospel of what is called infidelity pours the oil and wine into the wounds, and breathes hope into the hearts of those who have fallen among thieves and robbers.

God forbid, then, that I should be ashamed of the gospel of infidelity, when applied to me by the advocates of slavery and war! For this is the gospel of Love which Jesus preached and lived. I can no more reject its spirit and essential principles, than I can my own existence.

## HENRY C. WRIGHT.

## SERMON.

PREACHED NOVEMBER 27, 1853.

BY CHARLES E. HODGES,

Minister of the First Parish in Barre, Mass.

Jeremiah viii. 20. 'The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved.'

The few who were present in this place on Thursday last, the day of 'Thanksgiving,' will remember that I declined availing myself of the usual license, granted to ministers on that day, of discussing matters not generally considered appropriate to the pulpit and the Sunday. They will remember, too, my reasons for this, given at the time—viz: That I held that beautiful day of home associations, and home life, in too great reverence and affection, to willingly say or do anything, which should disturb the serenity of grateful worship, or send any from the sanctuary to the home, with aught of asperity or ill-humor ranking in their breasts to cloud the sunshine of their domestic joys. And further, that I considered it a cowardly subterfuge of the clergy to refuse to recognize true reforms, as the Christian's work and duty, by preaching them on the 'Lord's day'—His day, who was the Prince of reformers. I consider it a partial, hypocritical, and therefore worthless tribute to the great work of reform in matters social and public, for ministers to take this secular day, once a year, as an occasion for quieting their consciences, by confessing that there are public measures, 'institutions,' and a popular opinion, which are not Christian—a day when there are few to hear and none to condemn the exercise of the licensed privilege of the occasion. Out of their own mouths are those, who take this course, condemned; for the church is opened on Thanksgiving day for Divine worship, as much as on Sunday. Whatever, therefore, is not a proper part of such worship on the Sunday, certainly is not for this or any other day of worship. God is ever the same, and desires true worship, whenever and wherever it is attempted. We will not presume to say, that He demands one kind on the first day of the week, and a different on the fifth. So, if there be any reason for the distinction which is commonly made by ministers, it must be looked for elsewhere. And the only conceivable reason, I think, is this,—that they conduct the exercises of a meeting for worship and instruction, not so much according to their convictions of what truth requires, or in obedience to the suggestions of conscience, as in conformity to the wishes and prejudices of their congregations. That is, they worship not God so much as the men who support them and the church organization. And so, I say, such ministers condemn themselves out of their own mouths, by recognizing the Christianity of opposing slavery, or war, or intemperance, or the present unjust inequality of the sexes, or any other existing and popular evil, one day in the year, and denying the Christianity of such movements by preserving them enshrined in eternal silence on every one of the fifty-two Sundays in each year. Any man who preaches an Anti-Slavery sermon, for instance, on Thanksgiving or Fast day, and never alludes to the subject again till the next year's day of free speech, is utterly inconsistent and cowardly, by his own tacit admission. The much more consistent man and minister is he, who never advocates any reform on any day of the year. For, as I have said, whatever is a proper part of Divine worship in the church for one day, is for every day; and what is not proper on one day, is improper on any and every day.

Moved by such convictions, I left unsaid some things, which, nevertheless, I thought to be considered at this time. You have passed your 'Thanksgiving' usefully and happily, I trust. And now, on the first day of meeting for worship and meditation, let me call your attention to one or two matters relating to that day—chiefly to those suggested by the invitations of our annual official proclamations, to render thanks for blessings, the possession and enjoyment of which, by us, may be fairly questioned. Truly, 'the harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved.'

Thanksgiving day, as I view it, is peculiarly a home day—a day of family re-unions and family joys, and of thanksgiving for and for the family and the home. For this and related blessings, I can earnestly and honestly give thanks. But there is something more than this contemplated in the present appointment of the day, as is evident from the language of the official announcement. It is regarded as a day for public thanksgiving, for reflecting upon and expressing gratitude for certain great State and National blessings, or both. And for all blessings, which are not theoretically, but in fact, secured to us by our laws and institutions of government, it is proper enough to feel grateful, and for a happy people to express their gratitude in a suitable manner. But the difficulty with me is, that I am quite unable to see in what respects we really do enjoy some of the privileges, for which, as a people, we are requested to give thanks. For me, therefore, to quietly read a public document which enumerates some of these, to say the least, questionable privileges, to read without comment or disclaimer, and then proceed to thank God for what I do not believe possessed, would be simply hypocrisy.

I propose, therefore, to refer to one or two things contained in the proclamation of our present Chief Magistrate, where are some things to which I most cordially assent, but others, from which I am cordially dissent. And it is not so much the last proclamation I criticize, as the same general blindness and error, which, as a common rule, pervade all similar documents from year to year and from Governors, of different politics—so much so, that it may be pardonable charity to regard it all as the stereotyped phrase of these papers, and meaningless as the prattle of a child, or as obsolete laws which still exist on the statute book, but no where else. Though I must confess that I am tempted to regard this as part of the political verbiage so prevalent and popular to-day. If so, not merely to be commented on and exposed to the common sense of the people, that they may see the folly thereof, but to be denounced by every honest man.

The proclamations usually commence, as does our last, with some general exhortations to respect the honored custom of our ancestors, in consecrating one day in the year to a recognition of God's providence in the affairs of men—to a devout observance of the day by the people of the Commonwealth—to thanksgiving and praise to the Father of mercies, for blessings, private and public—the fruitful season, and the various gifts which, when unperverted, are justly regarded as the legitimate result of God's perfect laws. Then, as a matter of needless repetition, without which, a proclamation would hardly be recognized, but without which it would certainly be more sincere, we are called upon to bless God for the inestimable blessings of civil and religious freedom.

Before speaking of this last, however, let me say a word in regard to a clause in our last proclamation. It is rather obscure; but if it means what alone it seems to mean, it shows a mistaken reverence for existing evil. In this case, an evil which is solely the result of selfishness and sin, but which is the interest of selfish prosperity to call one of God's inscrutable blessings. I cannot stay to discuss the subject presented. I will quote the words, and barely give what meaning I get from them. We should thank God, 'That in the glorious ordering of His providence, by which He has secured the solitary in families, He has preserved for us, amidst the temptations to evil by which we are surrounded, the compensating influence of numerous homes'—(very well, so far, but mark the end)—'whose varied fortunes are wisely planned to mould our nobler powers, and fit us for a higher and better life.' Now, the exception I take to this, is that I cannot regard the 'varied fortunes' of these homes, as any more a part of the plan of the Almighty, than that intemperance and lust are, in order that men may be bettered by passing through their fires, and emerge, finally, purified and reformed. Certainly, (and if I make myself understood, you will not think me captious.) God never designed or planned our present imperfect organization, in which wealth is virtue, and poverty a crime—in which a few men here and there possess inordinate means at the expense of the mass. Certainly, God never put these men here, like the booms in our eastern rivers, which grasp in their wide embrace the great wealth of lumber which those ancient forests drop into the stream, while the poor man in his skiff catches only the drift-wood and the waste which escape the monopolizer above. God never planned that these two or three men should, in this manner, catch and hold the great mass of floating wealth around them, leaving to the less favored multitude only the drift and dross which will barely support animal combustion. God never created monopolies or monopolies; they are the creatures and creations of avarice. A living English poet has fallen into this same error, of attributing to Providence the miseries of the poor. Among many beautiful things, he sings thus—

'When God built up the dome of blue,  
And portioned Earth's prolific floor,  
The measure of His wisdom drew  
A line between the Rich and Poor.  
And till that vault of glory fell,  
Or beauteous earth be scorched with flame,  
Or saving love be all in all,  
That rule of life will rest the same.  
We know not why, we know not how,  
Mankind are formed for weal or woe,  
But to the Eternal law bow,  
If such things are, they must be so.'

Here is the same grievous error, of attributing the palpably false condition of society to divine wisdom and foreordination. As I said, I have no time to discuss this question here. Simply this may be said, that these great and lamentable social inequalities are not of God, but of man's evil possessions, avarice, ambition, selfishness. So I cannot thank God for the 'varied fortunes of numerous homes,' nor for the presumed good thereof. That good, the fitting us 'for a higher and better life,' may be attained under a more generous, equal and Christian social order—one which will not only better fit us for a higher life, but give us greater happiness and culture in this present. Nor do I believe that because, or

'If such things are, they must be so.'

So much for one objection to the document, some of whose doctrines we are considering. I must pass over these things hastily; yet there is one sentiment, and little more than a sentiment in this document, which I cannot pass by.

We are here told to thank God 'that He has been pleased to continue to us the inestimable privileges of civil and religious freedom'; and 'that He has given to our keeping, and made clear to our consciences, those precious principles of liberty which secure our prosperity.' &c. &c. How clear these principles are in the general conscience, is very evident. Undoubtedly, it is God's pleasure that we should enjoy, to the fullest extent, those 'inestimable privileges.' But His providences are not immediate. He gives us blessings, which we may profit by, or pervert, as we will. He does not compel us to appreciate and enjoy them. We have them to use or abuse, at our pleasure, with sufficient light bestowed to show us how we may best enjoy them; as a father gives his child a toy—a knife, for instance,—with which to exercise his ingenuity and amuse himself. He teaches the boy the use of the implement, but he does not encase his hand in iron lest he should cut his fingers, nor insure him against its loss. The boy is grateful for the gift none the less because he is not secured against injury, if he misuse it, or the possible danger of its being taken from him by force. But suppose a company of wanton boys come up, and actually do snatch that knife away, and then tell their justice, that if he dare speak of his loss and denounce their injustice, they will beat and perpetually persecute him. And, suppose further, that one of the guilty party, with solemn mockery, exhorts the boy to be very grateful to his father for the kindness which gave him the instrument of which he is forcibly deprived. Under these circumstances, would not the boy's feelings be those of natural indignation? Would he not be outraged at the barefaced hypocrisy of his adviser? And would he not, with justice, say—It is not for you to speak to me of gratitude! The question between us, is, do you justify this net of your companions? If not, denounce it. If otherwise, then enjoy your share in their injustice; but do not call on me to be grateful for a blessing, of which, through your and their instrumentality, I am deprived.

The application of this homely illustration is obvious. God gives us the blessings of civil and religious freedom, as other blessings. But he does not insure us against robbery of them by evil men. In power. He does not secure us against the injustice of unprincipled majorities.

Civil and religious freedom! Have we them? In a measure, yes—in their fulness, no! Have the great political parties, of which our chief magistrates have, so far, always been, sought to secure these blessings to us? No! Have they sought to deprive us of them? Yes! With what sincerity, then, if his words mean any thing, does any man, of either party, call upon you and me to thank our God for these mercies of his, of which we have in no small measure robbed us, and in the first exercise of which they are doing all in their power to hinder us to-day?

What is our religious freedom? It is simply freedom in the choice of theological doctrine—freedom to be Unitarian or Trinitarian, Swedenborgian or Catholic. But is this the full meaning of these great words, Religious Freedom? Is there not included in them, when fairly understood, the right to expound the supreme laws of God, and assert their supremacy over human codes—the right to bring religion down as the measure of practical life, public and political, as well as private; and having tried, by this inflexible test, to expose the want of conformity wherever found, and to warn men against becoming partners in the guilt, does it not mean all this, and even more? And yet, the organized Christianity of the day, the nominal Christian Church, with its religious policy gathered from polluted channels, frowns upon any man who dares be wholly and universally a Christian. Our congregations seal the lips of their ministers with dollars; or demand silence on those points, at the cost of petty persecution, or the inglorious martyrdom of expulsion from the pulpit. The prevailing Christianity will have only prophets who prophesy smooth things. The Church is no longer the nursery of the pure truths of God; it is no longer good before the people; it is no longer exalted wicked rulers to tremble in their seats of power, or the supple tools of place and party to see their wickedness. It condemns not now the unhalloved influence of gain, nor scourges the money-changers from the Temple. Alas! it grovels, and trails its once bright garments in the dust, creeping, cringing, crawling, where it should command. It says to the people, not, Be the god of this idolatry cast down, and the true God worshipped in its stead, but it says, 'Thy people shall be my people, and thy god my god.' It says to the money-changers, Make me thy servant, so thou but give me a share in thy spoils. It says to the politician, The voice of conscience shall be hushed at your bidding. It says to the State, Power, position, influence are yours—I yield to your supremacy. You may make what laws you will; you may form whatever compact with the spirit of evil you will; you may legalize slavery and war; you may give the prestige of your sanction to intemperance, or the unequal and unjust privileges of sex, and we, the Church and her ministers, will be hushed as the earth before a tempest. We will declare the State, however constituted, a divine institution, and human law the highest law! And so it is; the Church goes to the caucus and the Exchange to learn the truths she must preach, and her vision coming through such polluted channels is false. The Church needs vision, she needs to be freed from pusillanimous ministers, and worldly-minded men. She needs to throw off the incubation of her dead forms, her idle ceremonies, and restrictive creed, and lay hold of the mighty evils of practical life. She must be the reformer of the world, and declare unto men their duties as men and Christians in the busy struggles of life. Abstractions! they must be put aside. Foolish controversies on foolish points of theology must be ended; and men must be roused, by the recognized messengers of truth, to a real, humanizing, practical religion. If the Church does not this, then will she be deserted by the most earnest men, who will not, longer, be filled with husks and chaff. It is for such religion, too much as I have described it, and such religious freedom, that we are to thank God once a year.

And our civil freedom, what is that? It is the subordination to riches and slavery. We enjoy freedom under a government, State and national, which protects property, and not men; which fosters the wrong of the one, and subverts the rights of the other. And slavery, the greatest sin of our land,—of which I have spoken to you in detail so many times that I need say little of it now,—slavery it is, which virtually deprives all of civil liberty. It does not meet the difficulty to say, we are not dwellers in slave territory. The evil knows no geographical limits. It pervades the whole land, to corrupt its inhabitants, and curtail their freedom. We are a part of that union, which, with as shameless effrontery as a courtesan wears her shame, declares that its stability and prosperity depend upon sustaining slavery. We live under a Constitution, which no logic can free from its fatal recognition of property in man. We are citizens of a State which has mobbed defenceless women and noble men, for daring to speak and act for freedom; which suffered its accredited agent, in a Southern city, sent there under State authority, peacefully to test the validity of an oppressive law, to be insulted and ignominiously driven home, without so much as a word of protest. A State, which, working against the liberties of its citizens, hangs its Court-House in emblematic chains; which sent from its capital city, from its 'temple of justice,' in sight of its Christian Churches, with its armed militia for an escort, a brother man, a son of God, back to the misery and degradation from which he had escaped; which supports an infamous law, whereby, if you or I refuse to become its ministers, we are liable to imprisonment like a murderer or a thief, and to be expelled, perchance, of the little property which we possess; a State which acknowledges the right of a few thousand men at the South, by their unjust slave representation, to control the legislation of the entire country, with its more than twenty millions, and so called, free inhabitants. This is our civil liberty! And for this, too, we are invited to assemble in our usual place of worship, and thank God, on a special day once a year.

Now, in view of these facts, to which I have only alluded, what shall we say of these proclamations for Thanksgiving days? Are they hypocritical? Answer for yourselves, to your own conscience, and have I offended? If so, God forgive you, for I only speak the truth; and truth should not offend. It is time that all shame should be exposed; that men may learn to judge for themselves of the sincerity and truth of popular opinions, and to understand what blessings they really do enjoy. That they may not conclude, from all this boastful Babel prating of freedom which we hear from press and pulpit, the caucus, the exchange, the Government, that therefore we are truly free. Freedom is not sound, but solid substance; and the degradation of men is never more plainly shown, than by their quietly believing, that because selfish and interested parties call a curse a blessing, it therefore is a blessing which is ours. We need a savior, as 1800 years ago, to unseal our blinded eyes, and give us vision.

With gratitude for our many blessings, let us mingle efforts to enlarge and perfect them, and to extend to all others in God's great universe, the same we would ourselves enjoy. We have the true salvation of the race yet to achieve, not by a morbid pietism, but by active and consistent Christian life.

Truly, 'The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved.'

'Men, whose boast it is that they come of fathers brave and free,  
If they breathe on earth a slave,  
Are ye truly free and brave?  
If ye do feel the chain  
When it works a brother pain,  
Are ye not base slaves indeed,  
Slaves unworthy to be freed?  
Is true freedom but to break  
Fetters for our own dear sake?  
And with leather bonds forget  
That we are mankind a debt?  
No! true freedom is to share  
All the chains our brothers wear,  
And with hand and heart to be  
Earnest to make others free.  
They are slaves, who fear to speak  
And with leather bonds forget  
That we are mankind a debt?  
They are slaves, who will not choose  
Hatred, scoffing, and abuse,  
Rather than in silence shrink  
From the truth they needs must think;  
They are slaves, who dare not be  
In the right with two or three.'

GOD.  
'I and my Father are one.  
'That ye may know and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in him.  
'And he that seeth me, seeth him that sent me.  
'And he that hath seen me, hath seen the Father.  
'Believe that I am in the Father, and the Father in me.  
'At that day, ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you.  
'I am the vine, ye are the branches.  
'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot hear them now.'

Having been interested in the remarks of C. K. W. and H. B. S., I wish to ask a question or two, that may be brought out the truth. They both agree that 'reason and common sense' are the ultimate arbiters of truth. Is not the distinctive theological feature of Christianity, as expounded by Christ, the assertion of himself as the God-man and man-God, and of the DIVINE HUMANITY of the Race?

Are we not really, literally, co-heirs with Christ?  
When C. K. W. and H. B. S. speak of God as a person, do they mean a real person, or an ideal person? Do they mean a person in the usual acceptance,—that is, having definite form, conditioned in time and space,—or do they use a form of words merely, having no conception or image attached or attachable to it?  
Neither common sense nor highest reason can form a logical or proper conception of a person, unconditioned in time or space, or unconditioned in form; and when discussing such questions, words should be strictly confined to their exact logical meaning.  
To sum all up, can we conceive of a Personal God apart from Man? If so, where and how? F. S. C.

Henry Ward Beecher is about to publish three volumes entitled, 'Star Papers,' the contributions he has furnished to the columns of the Independent during the past three or four years. The first volume will contain 'Experiences of Art and Nature'; the second, 'Religious Essays'; the third, 'Controversial Papers.'—*Ever-Past.*

WILLIAMS, PLUMB & CO.,  
IMPORTERS AND WHOLESALE DEALERS IN  
CHINA, GLASS AND EASTERN WARE.  
No. 71 BATTERY STREET,  
(One door East of Greenwich street, and in the  
vicinity of the North River Steamboat Land-  
ings, and the North River and Erie Railroad  
Depots.)  
THEIR assortment being complete in all the styles  
and qualities that comprise the stock of a Crockery  
House, they feel assured that they will be able to give  
the fullest satisfaction to all who say feel disposed to  
purchase their goods.  
N. B. One of the partners (Mr. Williams) is a COL-  
ORIAN, and has been connected with the CROCK-  
ERY TRADE of New York for twenty years, and for  
several years has conducted the business on his own  
account. A leading object in establishing the present  
firm, both by the parties themselves and their friends  
advisers, having been to contribute to the  
ELEVATION of the COLORED PEOPLE, by the  
introduction of a new and improved style of  
ware, and who would gladly avail themselves of any  
method and so favorable an opportunity to advance  
the cause of the colored people, as they have  
to hope to see all such in our establishment, and  
express the confidence that the future bestowal upon us  
by our friends will be the interest of themselves as well  
as us.  
This House sells at the lowest NET CASH PRICE,  
and will take the notes of responsible parties by adding  
seven per cent. per annum.  
JAMES WILLIAMS,  
DAVID PLUMB,  
JAMES J. ACHESON.

Lays of Quakerdom.  
THE publication of a SERIES of NEW POEMS,  
under this title, will commence in the  
KNICKERBOCKER MAGAZINE for DECEMBER.  
These Poems are intended to commemorate the ben-  
eficence of the 'Early Quakers,' and are from a pa-  
per of that people.  
The first will be 'The Execution of Mary Dyer,' at  
Boston, June 1st, 1659.  
An extra edition of the Magazine will be issued, but  
Agents and Periodical Dealers should send their orders  
early, to insure a supply. Nov. 25

1,000 Book Agents Wanted,  
To sell Pictorial and Useful Works for the year 1854.  
\$1,000 A YEAR.  
WANTED, IN EVERY SECTION OF THE UN-  
ITED STATES, active and enterprising men, to  
engage in the sale of some of the best books published  
in the country. To men of good address, possessing a  
small capital of from \$25 to \$100, such inducements  
will be offered as to enable them to make from \$5 to \$5  
a day profit.  
The Books published by us are all useful in their  
character, extremely popular, and command large sales  
wherever they are offered.  
For further particulars, address, (postage paid),  
ROBERT SEARS, PUBLISHER,  
228 1m 181 William Street, New York.

Reformed Medical Practice.  
DR. A. A. GIFFORD having returned to New Bel-  
ford, solicits a share of patronage in the com-  
munity.  
Office and residence, Nos. 120 and 121 Union street.  
New Bedford, Nov. 24. 54

WORCESTER  
HYDROPATHIC INSTITUTION.  
NO. 1 GLEN STREET.  
THIS Institution is well arranged for treatment all  
seasons. It will remain under the medical direc-  
tion of Dr. GEORGE HORT, until the return of Dr.  
ROBERTS from Paris, in April, 1854.  
TERMS, usually, from \$7 to \$20 per week.  
For treatment without board, \$3 to \$4 per week.  
Oct. 10, 1853.

VISITORS TO NEW YORK  
CAN find accommodations, by the DAY or WEEK,  
at our establishment,  
164 TWELFTH STREET,  
Corner of University Place, one Block West of Broad  
way.  
TERMS.—From \$1 to \$2 per day; from \$5 to \$10.50  
per week.  
We intend also to furnish the best accommo-  
dations found in any city for the residence and treatment  
of Water Cure patients.  
O. H. WELLINGTON, M. D.  
New York, Sept. 23, 1853. 6t

GOOD NEWS FOR THE INVALID!  
LADY SUNDENLAND'S Pamphlet on 'Dieting  
by Nutrition, without Drugs,' will be sent to you,  
free of postage, on the receipt of one letter stamp, pre-  
paid. Address 'NEW METHOD OF CURE,' Boston, Mass.  
O 25

VISITING DENTIST.  
DR. M